

**Appl. No.** : **10/506,361**  
**Filed** : **May 16, 2005**

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace Figure 2 of Sheet 2 with Figures 2 and 3 of the attached Replacement Sheet. The amendment to the drawings introduces no new matter.

Appl. No. : 10/506,361  
Filed : May 16, 2005

### REMARKS

Claims 1-9 stand rejected. Independent Claim 1 has been amended. Thus, Claims 1-9 are presented for consideration and further examination in view of the following amendments and remarks. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and remarks.

#### Objections to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(u) for having more than one figure with a common reference number. Applicant has provided replacement sheets for the drawings with the upper and lower views of Figure 2 re-labeled as Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Applicant has also amended the specification to reflect this change. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

#### Rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the recitation of "and/or" in the phrase "gaseous and/or liquid fluids" in Independent Claim 1 renders that claim indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to delete "gaseous and/or liquid" and recite simply "fluids," thus clarifying the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

#### Rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) under Krannak

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,070,013 (Krannak). The Examiner rejected dependent Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krannak in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,240,520 (Dailey et al.) The Examiner also rejected dependent Claims 7 and 8 under Krannak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,202,383 (Reiter) and U.S. Patent No. 5,647,910 (Reiter), respectively. With respect to the anticipation rejection of independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the

Appl. No. : 10/506,361  
Filed : May 16, 2005

claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

The Examiner asserts that Krannak discloses a connection coupling having “a guide sleeve (28) with longitudinal grooves (54)... arranged between [a] sliding sleeve [(70)] and... collet chucks [(56)] in which the collet chucks are guided.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. As can be seen in Krannak Figures 3 and 6, each jaw (part 56 is identified as corresponding to the collet chucks of the present claims) is a discrete unit; the jaws (56) do not continuously surround the coupling structure. Thus, with reference to Figure 3 in Krannak, starting at the center of the coupling and moving directly to the right, one encounters a sealing member (36), a body (28), and a sleeve (70), in that order, without encountering a jaw (56) at all. Starting at the center point again but moving in a direction 60 degrees from the horizontal, one encounters the sealing member (36), the body (28), a jaw (56), and then the sleeve (70), in that order. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the body (part 28 is identified as corresponding to the guide sleeve of the present claims) does not lie *between* the sleeve (70) and a jaw (56) in the Krannak coupling as illustrated in the transverse sectional view of Figure 3.

To clarify the claimed structure, Claim 1 has been amended to recite “[a] connection coupling... having a longitudinal axis, comprising... a guide sleeve..., at least a portion of the guide sleeve being disposed between the sliding sleeve and [] collet chucks along an axis perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the coupling.” Applicant respectfully submits that Krannak fails to disclose at least this structure as recited in Claim 1. The applied prior art of record does not cure this deficiency in the Krannak reference. Accordingly, because Krannak does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claim 1 has been overcome.

Claims 2-9 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and, thus, are patentable for at least the same reasons that the claim from which they depend is patentable over the applied art. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. : 10/506,361  
Filed : May 16, 2005

Any remarks in support of patentability of one claim should not be imputed to any other claim, even if similar terminology is used. Any remarks referring to only a portion of a claim should not be understood to base patentability on solely that portion; rather, patentability must rest on each claim taken as a whole. Applicant has not presented arguments concerning whether the applied references can be properly combined in view of the clearly missing elements noted above, and Applicant reserves the right to later contest whether a proper motivation and suggestion exists to combine these references.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the Examiner's rejections and each of the Examiner's assertions regarding what the prior art discloses or teaches, even if not expressly discussed herein. Although changes to the claims have been made, no acquiescence or estoppel is or should be implied thereby; such amendments are made only to expedite prosecution of the present application and are without prejudice to the presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims relating to the same or similar subject matter.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the noted rejections and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if an issue requires clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve any such issue promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: MAY 1, 2007

By: 

James F. Herkenhoff  
Registration No. 51,241  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550